

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GRACE MILES,

No. C-08-4091 MMC

Appellant,

**ORDER DENYING APPELLANT'S  
CORRECTED REQUEST FOR DIRECT  
APPEAL CERTIFICATION**

v.

ROYCE MAKISHIMA, et al.,

Apellees.

/

Before the Court is appellant Grace Miles's ("Miles") "Corrected Request for Direct Appeal Certification," filed October 9, 2008, by which Miles seeks an order certifying for appeal the Bankruptcy Court's July 16, 2008 Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Remand and Vacating Hearings. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of the request, the Court deems the matter suitable for decision thereon, see Civ. L.R. 7-1(b), hereby VACATES the hearing scheduled for November 21, 2008, and rules as follows.

A district court may certify for appeal to the court of appeals a judgment, order, or decree of a bankruptcy judge (1) that "involves a question of law as to which there is no controlling decision of the court of appeals for the circuit or of the Supreme Court of the United States, or involves a matter of public importance;" (2) that "involves a question of law requiring resolution of conflicting decisions;" or (3) where "an immediate appeal from the judgment, order, or decree may materially advance the progress of the case or

1 proceeding in which the appeal is taken." See 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2)(A).

2 Here, Miles relies primarily on the first of the above-referenced three grounds.<sup>1</sup> (See  
3 Pl.'s Request at 4.) Miles has failed to make an adequate showing, however, that the  
4 above-referenced order of the Bankruptcy Court "involves a question of law as to which  
5 there is no controlling decision . . . or involves a matter of public importance." See §  
6 158(d)(2)(A)(i).

7 Accordingly, the Corrected Request is hereby DENIED.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9  
10 Dated: October 22, 2008

  
MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
United States District Judge

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

---

28 <sup>1</sup>Although Miles cites to all three subsections of § 158(d)(2)(A), she provides argument only as to the first.